

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 69 are pending in the above-identified application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 69 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 18, 26, 28, 43, and 58 are amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 69 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15-22, and 24 – 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953).

Although Applicants respectfully traverse these claim rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to remove any ambiguities that may have been at the basis of these rejections, and to clarify the invention.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication control apparatus, which comprises a request processing unit and a communication control unit.

Claim 1 recites “a request processing unit for inquiring to a designated communication apparatus whether it intends to attend multipoint communication when receiving information designating that communication apparatus and a request seeking the attendance of that designated communication apparatus in the multipoint communication, and for sending to the designated communication apparatus information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication.” Further, as amended Claim 1 recites that “the necessary information comprises access point information, a communication control script, and security information.”

The Examiner indicates that Maekawa teaches sending information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication to the designated communication apparatus, and points to Column 4, lines 29 – 33 and Column 5, lines 37 – 49.

However, Maekawa discloses in Column 4, lines 29 – 33 that:

“(2) Response Function: a function of sending back a response indicating participation or absence in a multipoint intercommunication in response to an inquiry as to participation in the multipoint intercommunication performed by the inquiry function.”

and in Column 5, lines 37 – 49, that:

“Processing for sending back a response to the inquiry as to participation in the multipoint intercommunication will be described below with reference to the flow chart in FIG. 4.

In step S21, a member selects participation in or absence from the multipoint intercommunication. It is checked in step S22 if participation is selected. If it is determined based on an input from the operation unit 13 that participation is selected, the flow advances to step S23, and a response indicating participation in the multipoint intercommunication is sent to a member who inquired. This response is attained by the response function. In practice, data indicating participation in the multipoint intercommunication is sent to a member who inquired, via the line interface unit 16.”

Thus, Maekawa does teach a function of sending back a response indicating participation or absence in a multipoint intercommunication in response to an inquiry, and that data indicating participation in the multipoint intercommunication is sent to a member who inquired.

However, in Maekawa the inquiry fails to teach or suggest sending to the designated communication apparatus information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication, with the necessary information comprising access point information, a communication control script, and security information.

Accordingly, Maekawa fails to anticipate Claim 1.

Claim 13 has been amended by incorporating relevant limitations of Claim 14, similar to the claim 6 limitations discussed above, to distinguish Claim 13 from Maekawa.

Claim 18 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of Claim 23, similar to the claim 6 limitations discussed above, to distinguish Claim 13 from Maekawa.

Claim 26 has been amended, by adding limitations analogous to those of Claim 1, to recite “the necessary information comprises access point information, a communication control script, and security information.”

Thus, Claims 1, 13, 18, and 26 are allowable over Maekawa, as are their respective dependent claims for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 7 and 14

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953) in view of Dinwoodle (U.S. Patent 6,415,269). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 and 14 are directly or indirectly dependent on Claims 1 and 13, which were shown above to be allowable over Maekawa. Moreover, Dinwoodle fails to teach or fairly suggest sending to the designated communication apparatus information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication, with the necessary information comprising access point information, a communication control script, and security information. Thus, Maekawa and Dinwoodle may not properly be combined to reject Claims 1 and 13.

Accordingly, Claims 7 and 14 are allowable over Maekawa in view of Dinwoodle. Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 28 - 68

Claims 28-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa (U.S. Patent 5,663,953) in view of Kenichi (JP 11272577). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 28, 43 and 58 have been amended to an analogous limitation to that of the amended Claim 1.

Based on the above anticipation discussion, Claim 1 is allowable over Maekawa in view of Kenichi. Moreover, Kenichi fails to teach or fairly suggest sending to the designated communication apparatus information necessary for the designated communication apparatus to attend the multipoint communication, with the necessary information comprising access point information, a communication control script, and security information.

Thus, Claims 28, 43 and 58 are also allowable over Maekawa in view of Kenichi. Their respective dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 69 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 28, 2006

By: David R. Metzger
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000